DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 469 SP 040 955

AUTHOR Sosin, Adrienne Andi; De Lawter, Kathryn
TITLE Social Constructs of Validity and Value in a Multi-Layered Action Research Investigation of the Global Perspectives Calendar Project for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 2002-04-03
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; *Consciousness Raising; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Diversity (Student); Elementary Secondary Education; *Global Approach; Group Discussion; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Teacher Researchers; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Global Awareness; Reflective Thinking; Social Justice

ABSTRACT

An action research study addresses validity and value in teacher education by discussing thematic constructs and making specific normative underpinnings explicit. Concerned with developing teachers' abilities to create democratic classrooms and dispositions toward social justice, this study is a multi-layered, longitudinal inquiry into classroom processes and preservice teachers' constructions of meaning. Students design an artifact to be used as a multicultural calendar in a classroom. Through an interpersonal negotiation of meaning the researchers call collective reflection, the calendar artifact reveals presuppositions about cultural stereotypes, curriculum, and teaching. The methodological contribution of this research is the extension of an interpersonal discourse methodology, collective reflection, to embrace a textual dimension that offers an authentic path for developing global perspectives. (Contains 41 references.) (Author/SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 469

Running head: Validity & Value: The Global Perspectives Calendar

Social Constructs Of Validity And Value In A Multi-Layered Action Research Investigation Of The Global Perspectives Calendar Project For Teacher Education

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Adrienne Sosin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Adrienne Andi Sosin
City College of New York

Kathryn De Lawter
Pace University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 3, 2002

Abstract

The authors address validity and value in an action research study in teacher education by discussing their thematic constructs and making explicit their normative underpinnings. Concerned with developing teachers' abilities to create democratic classrooms and dispositions towards social justice, this study is a multi-layered, longitudinal inquiry into classroom processes and pre-service teachers' constructions of meaning. Students design an artifact to be used as a multicultural calendar in a classroom. Through an interpersonal negotiation of meaning the authors call collective reflection, the calendar artifact reveals presuppositions about cultural stereotypes, curriculum, and teaching. The methodological contribution of this research is the extension of an interpersonal discourse methodology, collective reflection, to embrace a textual dimension that offers an authentic path for developing global perspectives.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP040955

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Social Constructs: Classrooms, Validity, Value and Teacher Action Research

We are social constructivists committed to honoring meaning as it is expressed in teacher education contexts. We recognize that, "For action research, with its need for responsiveness and change, different concepts of validity are required. All paradigms seek to understand the world. Action research wishes to use this understanding to inform simultaneous action" (Dick & Swepson, 1994).

As both teacher educators and action researchers, we are invested in developing persons who advocate for social justice, children and teachers. We believe teacher education must address the entrenchment of parochial values. This means that pre-service curriculum must be designed for experiential learning of genuine respect that goes well beyond tolerance. Teachers interact with children, but they also need to connect with parents, colleagues and the public. Since discriminatory behavior can affect children for the rest of their lives, a primary goal of our work in teacher education is the development of global perspectives (Diaz, Massialas, and Xanthopoulos, 1999).

To develop global perspectives, we cultivate awareness of presuppositions and biases. We are concerned with our own, and with prospective teachers', consciousness of self and "the other." We believe that to develop a deep understanding of students' cultures, prospective teachers must not only experience an atmosphere conducive to risk-taking but also use language to intentionally build bridges across differences. As teacher educators aware of the constraints of our context, we are determined to do whatever we can to provide a place where people can talk to one another in ways that may influence how they ultimately see and relate to others. We believe that when people locate themselves in a relationship that values listening and builds trust, they make space for

listening. As Friere and Macedo (1987) state, "...it is through multiple discourses that students generate meaning in their everyday social context."

In our classroom experiences we value verbal and non-verbal interaction that creates human connections. We recognize that developing global perspectives is a life long process. The critical importance of verbalizing stereotypical thoughts allows questioning of meanings that may have been long held. Therefore, in our classrooms we encourage interpersonal discourse that purposefully reaches toward openness and understanding. We identify this discourse as collective reflection.

What is collective reflection?

Collective reflection is a use of language that makes democratic talk and interaction the norm. It is interpersonal discourse that values each person's participation, thoughts, and feelings. Participants' ideas are understood as social constructions of meaning viewed in context. Collective reflection is a process that recognizes that knowledge is inherently personal (Polanyi, 1964). Personal knowledge is informed by an individual's physical and social location in time, and their experiences, education, purposes, priorities and choices.

Collective reflection is constructivist, focusing on meanings rather than behaviors, and recognizes both focal and tacit meanings inherent in a situation. It is conversational. It employs dialogic reciprocity that grows with practice. It is a process that appreciates explorations and the forming of conclusions that are visited and revisited to sustain, modify, and change one's ways of thinking.

In collective reflection, there is an expectation that listening is valued and that speaking comes from the heart as well as mind. Acceptance of "the other's" ideas does

not necessarily entail agreement but respect for authentic voices. With this empowerment, people see themselves as citizens who in solidarity can strive for more just social environments, and belong to groups that prioritize the common good. They realize they can establish relationships of trust grounded in respect to make a difference in the quality of life of a community and to build bridges between communities.

Collective reflection in teacher education research (De Lawter & Sosin, 2000) is a process purposefully undertaken with a peer to explore meanings. The inquiry calls upon our collective personal knowledge to interpret students' constructions of meaning, whether expressed in talk and interaction, or in an artifact. It is a suspending of final answers and a welcoming of another's perspectives. It is an active assertion and valuing of keeping open to alternative interpretations. It embraces the probing of what is taken for granted and honors the changing of one's mind about things familiar and unfamiliar. Collective reflection is a recognition of the human capacity to use language to bring people together, rather than to tear them apart.

Collective reflection as a research method enables us to engage in authentic conversation as a mode of teacher research (Feldman, 1999). Expressing findings and understandings derived from our inquiry process requires us to carefully examine our language. To best express the nuances of our negotiations, we labor to shape the most apt description for the reader. We find this project to be an extremely intense engagement with ideas that have taken years to formulate and be voiced. Our mutual goal is to communicate and share our work with an interested audience, with human and professional connections to teaching. As we structure our work in teacher education, the

prospect of collective reflection holds promise for teachers in reaching students on a daily basis.

The Global Perspectives Multicultural Calendar

We are particularly interested in helping our pre-service teachers become aware of the dilemmas they will face as teachers of diverse urban students. To prepare teachers to confront the problems of curriculum design, we assign an ambiguous project for which the evaluative criteria are very broad. This project, the "Global Perspectives Multicultural Calendar," is a semester-long assignment to create an artifact intended for future classroom use. Students display their sense of multicultural curriculum for their future teaching practice. We ask the students to create a multicultural calendar that attempts to meet criteria of imagination, educative/usefulness, and interactivity, among other criteria. The global perspectives calendar project, as an ambiguous, self-reflective task, in which each student has a role in interpretation, creation, and assessment, produces much discussion and questioning from teacher education students.

After the course is completed, we collect samples of calendar artifacts supplied by selected consenting students. These original student-made multicultural calendar artifacts are the central source of data for this study. In a process of constant comparative analysis (Dye, Schatz, Rosenberg, & Coleman, 2000), over several years and multiple sections we have catalogued the calendars that students have made.

Interpreting Artifacts-as-texts: Extending Collective Reflection

Our study of preservice teachers' multicultural calendars extends collective reflection by negotiating meaning in a process of interpreting the multicultural calendar artifacts-as-texts. The practice of interpreting artifacts-as-texts (De Lawter, 1982) has

implications for making sense of the meanings and beliefs of artifact-makers. A basic assumption of this study is that representations in students' calendar artifacts indicate their views of multicultural curriculum development and teaching (De Lawter, Sosin & Mabey, 2001).

What Is The Process Of Interpreting Artifacts-As-Texts?

Our interpersonal methodology, collective reflection, with its concern for meaning, offers a textual dimension by viewing and interpreting calendar artifacts. This textual methodology is grounded in hermeneutics, or interpretation theory, which offers a view of discourse as language-in-use (Ricoeur, 1976). Viewing meanings in context within boundaries of textual interpretation, the artifact is valued as a purposeful construction in a time and place, to be interpreted later by others from their perspectives and contexts. The "problem" of interpretation posed by artifact makers' representations opens up multiple, possibly competing, valid interpretations.

Artifacts-as-texts exist and are interpreted in the absence of the maker/author. The onus of interpretation is on the interpreter with all her/his limitations of understanding of the purpose, time and place the artifact was made and by whom. Therefore, the interpreter must ask questions of the artifact and utilize any clues to the meanings for which there is evidence.

The artifact-as-text is open to infinite interpretations. At the same time, the artifact cannot mean just anything the interpreter wants it to mean. Each artifact's "propositional content" (Ricoeur, 1976) serves as an agreed upon basis for interpretation. Questioning is necessary both of the artifact and of the interpreters' ideas brought into relation with the artifact. Collective reflection becomes important because as different

perspectives are brought into the interpretation, more insights into possible meanings come into view. The presuppositions of the interpreters become accessible for clarification, for relevance to the particular interpretation at hand, for codification, and for ownership. This part of the process is extremely important because it reveals the interpreter's biases as well as knowledge and understandings that may be applicable to the interpretation.

The Classroom As A Social Construction

Our phenomenological underpinnings are foundational to our accounts of both the interpersonal and textual meanings students bring to the teacher education situation. Students both shape their meanings and are shaped by them. This dialectic of meaning-making (Berger & Luckmann, 1967), informs our understanding of interpersonal action and intrapersonal reflection on the social construction (Schutz, 1962) of classroom realities. We view students' expressions of meaning as articulated public constructions of their personal knowledge, a concept conceived by Polanyi, (1964). Understanding that people's experiences are particular, but can have universal meaning is an important aspect of our work in teacher education for multicultural understanding and curriculum design.

Understanding the importance of language in creating the self and structuring the classroom is vital to teacher preparation. In the realm of socio-linguistics, Gee's (1996) concept of discourse as situated meaning offers guidance for teachers in dealing with issues of diversity, and the influences of culture on language. We intentionally attend to students' uses of language to bring out issues of diversity and cultural influences in our classrooms, and for their prospective classrooms.

Our dialogical conversational method of collective reflection with our students focuses on the representations of multicultural curriculum embodied in each calendar's design. Students' talk about the influence of their own cultural backgrounds on their calendar's creation informs our understanding. Students' calendar artifacts embody their representations of time, culture, knowledge, and curriculum. The process of viewing the students' artifacts as focal (Polanyi, 1967), also brings their tacit meanings into the classroom.

We define our classroom practices as the interpretive work (Garfinkel, 1967) of action, response, and reflection. This includes the recognition and questioning of participants' taken-for-granted ways of viewing the world. This interpretive work creates a pivotal juxtaposition for understanding the reciprocity between our interpersonal method and our textual interpretive method. As we focus on the importance of teachers socially constructing their own classrooms, they become aware of reciprocity between the meanings they construct interpersonally and those they construct with texts. This awareness can empower prospective teachers as self-conscious language users, and is at the heart of our dual methodologies.

Videotapes made in-class of the makers telling about their artifacts, and contemporaneous documents created during the holistic scoring of their calendars supply additional data for our study. Data is triangulated by reference to the physical artifacts, accompanying materials, video recordings, researchers' notes and transcriptions of recorded conversations. Each instance of collective reflection builds on what came before and contributes to a discourse process that deepens understanding.

Thematic Constructs

Interaction with the calendar artifacts leads to "thematizing" (Greene, 1991). We recognize the centrality of the interpretation of artifacts-as-texts, and identify the process of collective reflection in the classroom as praxis in teaching. These thematic constructs are "generative themes" (Friere, 1993), which overlap and are integral to each other. Collective reflection and interpreting artifacts-as-texts represent methodological processes we are using to understand the data. The third theme, praxis in teaching, represents the process of integrating theory and practice in conscious acts of multicultural curriculum development. The three constructs scaffold an understanding of interpretive processes of representation in teacher education.

Methodological Background

In our research centering on the global perspectives multicultural calendar, we have found that the multicultural calendar project in its many facets provides experiences that open prospective teachers to others' and to their own presuppositions about cultural stereotypes, curriculum, and teaching. We locate this work within the critical pedagogy movement, which questions power, authority, and control in educational situations.

We recognize that teaching is a political act (McLaren, 1999; Giroux, 1983). In teaching global perspectives, our intention is to create awareness and consciousness of the need for teachers to address world concerns and stereotypes in their teaching. Being teacher educators in New York City, and preparing teachers for twenty-first century schools, we are clearly open about the social nature of our action research, in which we adopt a critical ethnographic stance to "foreground" questions of domination and

oppression (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000, p.153). We work toward empowering teachers. As Noffke (1997) notes,

> The literature on educational action research frames issues related not only to the quality and status of the profession but also to the meaning of quality in education in general. While some action research embodies technocratic models of teaching and learning, the majority of works push at the boundaries of curriculum, offering at least the possibility of changes that address not the legitimation of practices structured by existing conditions of schooling but the transformation of education through continuing thought and action.(p.334).

Our concern for developing consciousness and responsibility in future educators underlies the practice of collective reflection in our classroom discourse and research methodologies. In purposefully opening awareness to personal and cultural presuppositions, we are acting to bring about social justice in the new generation of teachers.

We have been informed by qualitative research methodologies, including teacher action research methods (Burnaford, Fischer & Hobson, 1996; Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 1998). Conversational and case study (Yin, 1984) methods, and other qualitative approaches used by teachers to investigate their own practice offer us admirable examples of teachers who engage in reflective study of their teaching practices (Schön, 1983) and in self-study (Zeichner, 1999).

Validity As A Social Construction

Validity is a requirement for all research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000), and has taken on differing meanings as it has been addressed in qualitative research. In shaping our multi-layered investigations we have examined validity as part of our inquiry. While validity has been considered "a problem," (Kirk & Miller, 1986), and discussed in terms of "paradigm wars" between the positivist and the naturalistic paradigms. (Munby, 2001), we have reconciled our understandings of validity with many recent discussions of validity in qualitative research (Ambert & Adler, 1995; Johnson, 1997; Mays & Pope, 2000; Winter, 2000). For qualitative research 'validity' is not considered to be a unitary, fixed or universal concept. It has a social connotation, contingent on the processes of the particular research methodologies used, the lived context of the participants, and the degree to which the researchers can interpret reality and disclose their own evaluative framework. Merriam's (1998) central assumption of qualitative research is, "that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and every-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured as in quantitative research" (p.202). This resonates, as we recognize the multidimensional nature of our education students' consciousness of the issues surrounding curriculum and teaching today, as evidenced in their multicultural calendar artifacts.

We also found it important to note a thread of common understanding about issues of validity in naturalistic research from different fields, including health, social and family relations, and education. In contrast to quantitative, positivistic research, which is concerned with controlling variables, predicting causality, replication, and objectivity,

teacher action research methodology has influenced our understanding of the concept of validity as an "epistemology of practice" (Noffke, 1997). Noffke cites action research methodology which emphasizes qualitative data collection methods that, " . . . share a commitment to the development of techniques that provide an evidential basis for action in classrooms rather than centering on traditional notions of validity" (p.326).

We began our research by making explicit our assumptions. We continue to identify purposes, biases, and differences in our backgrounds in order to distinguish our subjects' meanings from the meanings we bring to the study. To address claims of validity, like Maxine Greene (1994), we question epistemologies underlying educational research methodologies.

> . . . questions involving what constitutes knowledge, what validates knowledge claims, how "truth" is to be defined, how social and cultural conditions affect scientific investigations, how "understanding" differs from "knowledge," what "meaning" signifies, and what belief systems and locations in the world have to do with the determination of what is taken to be "real" and "true" (p.425).

We share Greene's interest in meaning and how knowledge, understanding and belief are determined to be true. As teacher-researchers, we inquire from our social and cultural standpoints into the work of others from different social and cultural backgrounds. We became aware of the validity issues surrounding critical ethnography, and of our need to achieve a standard of cultural validity (Morgan, 1999, as cited in Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2000). Thus, coming from our ethnic and socio-economic standpoints, we attend to cultural issues represented in the artifacts made by our students. We are

developing greater awareness of cultural validity by accounting for meanings that correspond to the realities of our students.

Value And Teacher Action Research As Social Constructions

The validity and value of collective reflection is found in the interpersonal engagement with a peer or peers to understand self and other. We agree with Mischler, (1990, as cited in Munby, 2001, p.5), who states that, ". . . validation is the social construction of a discourse through which the results of a study come to be viewed as trustworthy for other investigators to rely upon in their own work" (p. 426). Our search for valid meanings of our students involves two social constructions of discourse, one interpersonal, the other, textual. The discourse of collective reflection and interpreting artifacts-as-texts is interpretive work that is valuable to the extent it is trustworthy. Mischler's definition points to the validity that can be accomplished through the social construction of discourse.

The accomplishment of trustworthiness is essential to both our research and teaching methodologies. The generative themes of our study are the constructs that account for the trustworthy viewing, organizing, and exploring of meaning. Constant comparative analysis in multiple action research cycles has brought attention to "emergent themes" (Fischer, 1996). Through collective reflection we explore interrelationships among the emergent themes and how emergent themes interact with the generative themes. These generative and emergent themes are works in progress, to be seen and re-seen as the calendars are repeatedly read and interpreted.

Generative & Emergent Themes of Global Perspectives Multicultural Calendars

Many calendar artifacts have common characteristics, which gave rise to our identification of emergent themes. During collective reflection we agreed to create color-coded "theme cards" for use in exploring relationships among our generative and emergent themes. We found the theme cards offered different entry points for viewing the representations in the calendars and for negotiating their meanings. Through collective reflection and interpreting artifacts-as-texts, meanings were validated.

The following discussion highlights one of the emergent themes and its relationships to the generative themes that we have developed through interpreting the multicultural calendars as texts.

Labeling as Naming

The first emergent theme we identified is *labeling as naming*. This theme becomes evident during analysis of the ways students use words and icons to symbolize abstractions like nations or seasons. Some examples of icons used to represent special events in calendars include religious icons (menorahs, stars of David, crèches, Christmas trees, Easter eggs, masks for Carnival/Mardi Gras), symbols of personal celebrations of time (balloons for birthdays, faces for days honoring famous persons, diplomas for graduation), symbols of culture (people dressed in ethnic and national costumes, firecrackers for the Fourth of July, an eagle for Veteran's Day, a turkey for Thanksgiving, the Liberty Bell and Statue of Liberty to stand for freedom), and maps and flags to represent nations around the world.

We are struck by the way flags are so often used in the artifacts to signify that the calendar is multicultural. Many calendar artifacts display national flags, copied by hand,

cut and pasted from other printed material, knitted, sewn, decoupaged, or simply copied from the Internet or from a clip art collection. Some of the calendars incorporate flags in important roles. In other calendars, the role of flags is simply decorative; sometimes the maker gives reasons for including flags, and sometimes they do not. During presentations we listen closely when a maker draws attention to flags in the calendar, often using images that represent the different cultures and nations they anticipate will be present in their prospective classrooms. Across many presentations we have noticed a difference in how the maker discusses his/her rationale for including the flag. Some makers are very precise about which countries are represented in their calendars, and are knowledgeable about what each flag's features stand for in that country. Other calendar makers are imprecise and less aware of the flags' meanings.

We take into account students' talk about the flag icons during their presentations, and reinterpret them in repeated viewings of the artifacts. We interpret any written materials included with the calendar as well as transcripts of the maker's presentation to triangulate our understanding of students' representations. As we interpret the artifacts-as-texts, we collectively reflect about how the calendar makers use flags as a way of signifying nationality. We identify their significations along a continuum of the taken-for-granted communicative understanding that the reader would know the meaning and import of the symbol to a high awareness and critical perception of what a nation's flag symbol represents.

Our collective reflection about students' artifacts-as-texts leads to the emergence of *labeling-as-naming* as a theme. Understanding the use of icons, particularly flags, reveals the importance of naming as an intended act of recognition. Michelle Fine

discusses how naming is a political act. She defines *naming* as a special type of talk and attributes the silencing she has witnessed in schools as the fear of *naming*. "Naming gives license to critical conversation about inequitable distributions of power and resources, by which these [urban minority] students and their kin suffer disproportionately" (as cited in Power & Hubbard, 1996, p245). Fine sheds light on the problem of teachers benignly or unknowingly refusing to name sources of inequity. Her citation of Aronowitz & Giroux's, *Education under siege* highlights their statement that "Naming may indeed be dangerous to beliefs often promoted in public schools; it is for that very reason *essential* to the creation of an empowered and critical constituency of educated social participants" (as cited in Power & Hubbard, 1996, p. 246).

In our study of global perspectives calendars, we see students often use flag icons to identify nationalism, in a naïve, taken-for-granted, benign incorporation of different countries' flags. This is labeling-as-naming, using an inchoate icon to symbolize multicultural inclusion. While students' representations of flags extends, in a continuum to more critical perspectives, and particular intentions, such as in a calendar focused on a social studies curriculum about World War II, assumptions that shared meanings are available for interpretation apart from any context is problematic.

Discussion

We experience this multi-layered teacher action research study as "an unfolding dynamic process" (Fischer, 1996, p.48). We are continuing to study the calendar artifacts and engage in collective reflection with our students and with each other. As we do this work, we refine our methods and reach for alternative understandings.

As teacher educators we bring our values to our educative transactions and research practices; we are interested parties in the development of teachers who will offer choices and democratic options to children. We recognize that in our research and in the classroom, our interpersonal discourses about pre-suppositions, stereotypes and world concerns provide a basis for our locating ourselves in a wider world of diverse contexts and complex relationships. Collective reflection explicitly brings out the biases and philosophical orientations of researchers, teachers, and students. Challenging our preconceptions, we have come to richly value collective reflection as a process for structuring a democratic classroom (Giroux, 1981; Meier, 1995) as well as a research method.

Our view of student-constructed artifacts-as-texts that document their understandings of multicultural curriculum is integral to this study. Through a process of collective reflection we explore students' meanings and develop language for observation, analysis, and modification of our teaching practices. The emergent themes specify how the calendar makers represent their meanings. These themes speak to how the students have used representations as vehicles to communicate their conceptions of multicultural curriculum. In the pre-September 11th (2001) world we were working in, we interpreted the appearance of flags on calendars as a continuum of the taken for granted symbols of national heritage to the critically perceived incorporation of a particular icon in representing a particular intention. Now that American flags appear everywhere and flags are ubiquitous symbols of this nation's reaction to terrorism from abroad, the flags that appear on these calendars seem to have taken on a newer and more pronounced import. Even though the calendar makers may never have anticipated how their use of

flag icons would be perceived at a later date, the unintended consequences of their use of flags now have greater influence in the reading of the calendar, and may offer the reader a more influential notion of the maker's meanings by inclusion of the flag's nation in the intended curriculum.

In Bob Herbert's opinion-editorial column in the New York Times on March 28th, 2002, his point was that terrorism by suicide bombers, and the unending conflicts caused by ethnic strife betray humanity. In the column he calls for "a mobilization of ordinary people, in the U.S. and beyond, who are committed to the idea of stopping these insane outbreaks of violence and terror all around the globe." Herbert also states that,

> You do this by learning all you can about this scourge of violence that threatens to hold all of us hostage and sully the future for generations to come. And then you need to talk about it, with people you know, people you respect. And then comes the hard part, which is to try to figure out ways in a spirit of good will to speak across the divide, to people who are different, even strange.

Our hearing of Herbert's call for talk and action by ordinary people is that it rings especially true for teachers. Teachers must be part of the solution to terrorism, by teaching respect for differences that extends beyond tolerance and across the divisions of culture. Global perspectives, and the calendar project that encourages education students to consider the ways they think about multicultural curriculum, plays a vital and necessary part in teacher education.

The value of our research and work with the global perspectives calendar is voiced in Herbert's article. In "doing" collective reflection, in both our research

and teaching, we are trying to "figure out ways in a spirit of good will to speak across the divide." In our study of multicultural calendars and our self-study of our practice as teacher educators, our aims are to better prepare teachers for a multicultural society. We are therefore interested in understanding not only the actors' meanings, expressed in curricular artifacts, but understanding how to awaken and broaden their consciousness and purposefulness for taking social action. This is what teaching for social justice means to us.

The questions of validity for this study occur in the understanding of how the methodologies of collective reflection and interpreting artifacts-as-texts are adequate to exploring students' meanings expressed in their artifacts. We have explored and interpreted the students' multicultural calendars to determine what counts as evidence. We selected and made focal certain qualities in the artifacts. These qualities are evidence of personal meanings and interpretations constructed and communicated through encounter with the calendar artifact. After the events of September 11th, we have a ready example of how interpreting an artifact-as-text offers interpretations the maker could not have foreseen at the time of construction. The complexities of interpreting artifacts-as-texts require discussion beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, the validity of our methods lies in how our interpretations resonate within the context of multicultural curriculum.

We believe if future teachers come to conceive of students' artifacts-as-texts, they will be able to recognize and appreciate a different kind of relationship to their own creations and enjoy the design of multicultural curriculum in ways that transform teaching. The pedagogical and action research methodologies developed for this study

ask students to take the time to experience and reflect upon their personal knowledge and political consciousness. Their developing social awareness of global perspectives is evident in their acts of calendar artifact creation and evaluation. Through the identification and study of generative and emergent themes, pre-service teachers' meanings, and ways they envision multicultural education are made accessible.

Pre-service teacher education is the time prospective teachers transition from the role of student into the role of teacher. Making the transition happen is a challenge and an opportunity for the student and teacher educator alike. As experiential educators, we understand that students of teaching need to experience the process of making and evaluating their own work in order to develop the ability to look at and evaluate their students' accomplishments. The value of collective reflection and the interpretation of artifacts-as-texts in the development of pedagogical and research methodologies has the potential to transform teachers' education and make schools more democratic places.

References

Ambert, A. & Adler, P.A. (1995). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research [Electronic version]. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 57*, (4), 879-909.

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday.

Burnaford, G., Fischer, J. & Hobson, D. (Eds.) (1996). *Teachers doing research: Practical possibilities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. London: Falmer Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Review of research in education, 24*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association. . 249-305.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

De Lawter, K. (1982). *A constructivist's view of competency-based teacher education materials*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.

De Lawter, K. & Sosin, A. (2000). A self-study in teacher education: Collective reflection as negotiated meaning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA. April 25, 2000.

De Lawter, K., Sosin, A., & Mabey, J. (2001). Exploring Multi-Layered Representations in Research. *The Qualitative Report*. Available On-line at http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/index.html.

Diaz, C.F., Massialas, B.G., & Xanthopoulos, J.A. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Dick, B. & Swepson, P. (1994). Appropriate validity and its attainment within action research: an illustration using soft systems methodology [On line]. Available: http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/sofsys2.html.

Dye, J. F., Schatz, I. M., Rosenberg, B. A., & Coleman, S. T. (2000, January). Constant comparison method: A kaleidoscope of data [24 paragraphs]. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], *4*(1/2). Available: http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-4/dye.html.

Feldman, A. (1999). The role of conversation in collaborative action research. *Educational Action Research: An International Journal, 7*, 125-144.

Fischer, J. C. (1996). Open to ideas: Developing a framework for your research. In G.Burnaford, J. Fischer, & D. Hobson, *Teachers doing research: Practical possibilities*. 33-50.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Freire, P. and Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse*. (2nd ed.). Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Giroux, H.A. (1981). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1983). *Theory & resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Aldine.

Greene, M. (1991). Teaching, the question of personal reality. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.) *Staff development for education in the 90's: New demands, new realities, new perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, M. (1994). Epistemology and educational research: The influence of recent approaches to knowledge. In L. Darling-Hammond (ed.), *Review of research in education, 20*, (pp. 423-464). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Herbert, B. (2002, March 28). Betraying humanity. *The New York Times*, p. A31.

Johnson, R.B. (1997, Winter). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. *Education. 118* (2), 282-293.

Kirk, J. & Miller, M.L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. Sage University Paper series on Qualitative Research Methods, Volume 1. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Mays, N. & Pope, C. (2000/01/01). Assessing quality in qualitative research. *BMJ: British Medical Journal. 320* (7226), 50-53.

McLaren, P. (1999). A pedagogy of possibility: Reflecting upon Paulo Freire's politics of education. *Educational Researcher, 28* (2), 49-56.

Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Merriam, S.B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Munby, Hugh. (2001-03-00). Educational research as disciplined inquiry: Examining the facets of rigor in our work. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (St. Louis, MO, March, 2001). ERIC Document ED 454 270.

Noffke, S. (1997). Professional, personal, and political dimensions of action research. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education, 22*, (pp.305-343). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Polanyi, M. (1964). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy*. New York: Harper & Row.

Polanyi, M. (1967). *The tacit dimension*. New York: Doubleday.

Power, B.M. and Hubbard, R.S. (1996). *Language development: A reader for teachers.* New Jersey: Merrill.

Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Fort Worth, TX: The Texas Christian University Press.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schutz, A. (1962). Collected papers: Studies in phenomenological philosophy. In Maurice Natanson, (ed.) *Collected papers: Studies in phenomenological philosophy. Volume I.* The Hague: Martinus Nijoff.

Winter, G. (2000, March). A comparative discussion of the notion of 'validity' in qualitative and quantitative research. [58 paragraphs]. *The Qualitative Report* [On-line serial], *4*(3/4). Available: http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-3/winter.html.

Yin, R.K. (1984). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 22* (9), 4-15.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Social Constructs of Validity and Value in a Multi-Layered Action Research Investigation of the Global Perspectives Calendar Project for Teacher Education

Author(s): Adrienne Andi Sosin and Kathryn De Lawter

Corporate Source: City College of New York and Pace University

Publication Date: April 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ [X]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ [ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ [ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Dr. Kathryn De Lawter

Printed Name/Position/Title: ADRIENNE SOSIN, Assoc Prof KATHRYN DE LAWTER Assoc Prof.

Organization/Address: City College of New York NY NY 10031 Pace University N.Y. NY 10038

Telephone: 212-227-0017/212-346-1868 FAX: 212-233-4139

E-Mail Address: ASOSIN@CCNYCUNY.edu kdelawter@pace.edu

Date: 4/4/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

University of Maryland
ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory
College Park, MD 20742
Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)